

TC1600

REMSEN

Organization

Bldg./Room

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE


PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WASHINGTON, DC 20231

IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



U.S. OFFICIAL
\$01.0
02 1A 202245 MAY 05 2
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22

KUZN714 432192025 1503 04 05/13/04
FORWARD TIME EXP RTN TO SEND
KUZNETSOV, GEORGIY
6742 DALCROSS PL
CANAL WINCHESTER OH 43110-6787

RETURN TO SENDER

|||||

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

MAY 2 0 2004

RECEIVED

** to survivors
not a my work.*



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,307	02/26/2002	Georgiy Borisovich Kuznetsov		5537

31588 7590 05/05/2004

GEORGIY KUZNETSOV
2714 WINDHAM CLUB
COLUMBUS, OH 43219

EXAMINER

JOYNES, ROBERT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,307

Applicant(s)

BORISOVICH KUZNETSOV ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M. Joynes

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims –17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988)), the CAFC considered the issue of enablement in molecular biology. The CAFC summarized eight factors to be considered in a determination of "undue experimentation". These factors include: (a) the quantity of experimentation; (b) the amount of guidance presented; (c) the presence or absence of working examples; (d) the nature of the invention; (e) the state of the prior art; (f) the predictability of the prior art; (g) the breadth of the claims; and (h) the relative skill in the art.

(a) In order to utilize the system as claimed, the skilled artisan would be presented with an unpredictable amount of experimentation. An undetermined number of experimental factors utilizing a method for preventing malodor would have to be resolved by the practitioner for the reasons discussed below.

Art Unit: 1615

(b & c) The specification states that objects of the invention include providing a method for preventing malodor , and outlines a set of generic means/steps for implemented by the method, wherein the method utilizes germicidal compounds to terminate malodor production. However, the specification lacks a reasonable level of guidance for a method for said prevention of malodor, and working and/or prophetic examples are clearly absent. Applicant has not taught or defined how the invention arrives at a means for *preventing* malodor production. There is no guidance as how much of the composition prevents malodor, how often the composition needs to be applied, how long the effects last, nor any substantial teachings as to how the composition prevents, stops or cures malodor indefinitely.

(d) The nature of a method of preventing malodor production is complex.

(e & f) Although the art provides a certain level of guidance with regards to the use of compositions to treat malodor, these teachings do not provide sufficient guidance where the specification is lacking. The art demonstrates that various compounds in various compositions are used to treat malodor, but the art does not teach how to prevent the production of malodor.

(g) The claims are broad because there is no guidance for the appropriate selection of dosage or frequency of dosing.

(h) The level of skill of those in the art involving the prevention of malodor production is high.

The skilled practitioner would first turn to the instant specification for guidance in using the method of preventing malodor production as claimed. However, the

Art Unit: 1615

specification does not provide sufficient guidance for using the method of prevention as claimed. As such, the skilled practitioner would turn to the prior art for such guidance. However, the prior art does not teach a method of preventing malodor production as claimed. Finally, said practitioner would turn to trial and error experimentation to use a method of preventing malodor production without guidance from the specification or the prior art. Therefore, undue experimentation becomes the burden of the practitioner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by De Villez (US 4923900). De Villez teaches a method of cutaneous therapy for the treatment of body odor development comprising applying a composition comprising benzoyl peroxide (Abstract, Col. 2, lines 46-52; Col. 8, lines 1-9, Claim 1). The composition is in the form of a solution, cream, salve, foam or lotion (Col. 8, Claim 9). De villez therefore teaches the limitations of the instant claims, treating malodor by applying a composition comprising a peroxide, namely benzoyl peroxide. Claims 1-7 are anticipated by the teachings of De Villez.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1615

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Villez. The teachings of De Villez are discussed above. De Villez does not expressly teach the treatment of fomites. It is the position of the Examiner that the prior teaches the same method, treating the production of malodor, with one the compounds recited in the instant claims. The claims recite that fomites can be treated with oxygen. Oxygen is present in the air we live in. Therefore, when treating the production of malodor with the composition and then allowing the fomites to come in contact with the air surrounding us, the method of practiced. The Examiner fails to see any distinction for the method of stopping the fomites.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to that while treating the production of malodor under the arms of humans, one is also treating the fomites that aid in the production of the odor.

Art Unit: 1615

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to most effectively treat the production of odor under the arm of human in the safest and fastest manner.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Joyner whose telephone number is (571) 272-0597. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 8:30 - 6:00, alternate Fri. 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Notice of References Cited

Application/Control No.

10/083,307

Applicant(s)/Patent Under
Reexamination
BORISOVICH KUZNETSOV ET A

Examiner

Robert M. Joynes

Art Unit

1615

Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-4,923,900	05-1990	De Villez, Richard L.	514/714
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.